

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION NO : 4348 of 2005

Between:

T.R. Subramanyeshwar Rao, S/o. t. Mangaiah,
R/o. Cosmopolitan Club, Parasutata, Chilakalapudi Post, Machilipatnam.

..... PETITIONER

AND

- 1 Commanding Officer, 16(A) BN NCC, Brahmapuram, Machilipatnam.
- 2 District Employment Officer, District Employment Exchange.
Vijayawada, Krishna District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to Issue a writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of respondent as illegal arbitrary and against the principles of natural justice and in violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to call for the interview for the post of Watchman that may be held during the 2nd week of March 2005 or any other subsequent date.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.GONAKRISHNA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: MR.M.RAMALINGESWARA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: G.P. for Employment and Training

The Court, at the admission stage, made the following :

ORAL ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a Mandamus to declare the action of the 1st respondent in not calling the petitioner for interview to be held in the 2nd week of March, 2005 or any other subsequent date without insisting that his name should be sponsored by the Employment Exchange, as illegal and arbitrary.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Employment and Training and perused the material on record.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the 1st respondent called for an interview some persons whose names were registered with the 2nd respondent on or before 2004, but did not call the petitioner for the interview, though his name was registered with the 2nd respondent. Therefore, he prays to direct the 2nd respondent to sponsor the petitioner's name.

On the other hand, the learned Government Pleader for the 2nd respondent, on instructions, has contended that no list has been forwarded to the 1st respondent to sponsor the names of any persons.

Therefore, in view of the contention raised by the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent, the question of sponsoring the name of the petitioner to the post of Watchman does not arise and the writ petition is devoid of merit.

In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. In the circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

(K.C. BHANU, J.)

14th March, 2005

bcj

To

- 1 Commanding Officer, 16(A) BN NCC, Brahmapuram, Machilipatnam.
- 2 District Employment Officer, District Employment Exchange.
Vijayawada, Krishna District.
- 3 Two C.Cs. to the Government Pleader for Employment and
Training, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT)
- 4 Two C.D. copies.